



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/757,605

01/15/2004

Atsushi Fukuzato

NEG-329US

4925

21254

7590

04/10/2008

MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP, PLLC  
8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD  
SUITE 200  
VIENNA, VA 22182-3817

EXAMINER

KEEHN, RICHARD G

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2152

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/10/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/757,605	<b>Applicant(s)</b> FUKUZATO, ATSUSHI	
	<b>Examiner</b> Richard G. Keehn	<b>Art Unit</b> 2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-78 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 16-25, 31-40, 46-51, 57-62 and 68-78 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 11-15, 26-30, 41-45, 52-56 and 63-67 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/15/04 &amp; 6/2/06</u> .                                    | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

**Claims 1-78 have been examined and are pending.**

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

1. Claims 11-15, 26-30, 41-45, 52-56, 63-67, 74 and 76-78 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
2. Claims 74 and 76-78 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### ***Claim Objections***

4. Claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 17, 19, 20, 22, 32, 34, 35, 37, 46, 48, 57, 59, 68 and 70 are objected to because of the following informalities:
  - As to Claims 2, 4, 17, 19, 32 and 34, the phrase "said install request further including an installed list including therein the unique information and the URL of said group of objects" conflicts with Claim 1. Claim 1 states that the objects in the group each have a unique URL. Claim 2 states "the URL of said group" suggesting that the group, rather than each object, has the URL association. Examiner assumes

applicant meant “unique information and unique URL of said group of objects.”

Claims 4, 17, 19, 32 and 34 are objected to on a similar basis.

- As to Claim 5 and 46, the phrase “performs installs” is grammatically incorrect. Examiner assumes applicant meant “performs installing” or “installs.” Claim 46 is rejected on the same basis.
- As to Claims 5, 20, 35, 46, 57 and 68, the phrase “said mobile terminal referring to the list of unneeded objects sent from said information processing server to delete said unneeded object from said group of objects; and wherein said selected object and the deleted group of objects are stored in said terminal storage device as an updated group of objects by said mobile terminal” incorrectly mixes singular and plural tenses with respect to the term "object". It is unclear whether a single unneeded object, or a plurality of unneeded objects is to be deleted. Claims 20, 35, 46, 57 and 68 are objected to on a similar basis.
- As to Claims 6, 21, 36, 47, 58 and 69, the limitation “said information processing server forming a list of state of use of the objects, responsive to said install request, to store said list in said server storage device” does not make clear whether the list is kept with respect to the state of the mobile terminal’s usage, or the state of the server’s usage. Examiner assumes applicant meant the mobile terminal’s usage.
- As to Claims 7, 22, 37, 48, 59 and 70, the limitation “said information processing server referring to said recovery request list and the list of State of use of the objects stored in said server storage device to select from said plural objects stored in said server storage device said **unneeded** object to be installed by said mobile terminal

in said terminal storage device” contradicts prior Claim 5 and the inventive concept.

“Unneeded” objects would not be installed in the mobile terminal, but rather deleted as per Claim 5. Examiner assumes applicant meant to say “said needed object to be installed,” or perhaps “said selected object to be installed.” Appropriate corrections are required.

- As to Claims 7, 22, 37, 48, 59 and 70, the limitation “said information processing server forming a list of unneeded restoration objects, among the objects of said group of objects, having therein the unique information and the URL of the selected object which become unnecessary when the **unneeded** object has been installed in said terminal storage device, said information processing server transmitting the list of unneeded restoration objects to said mobile terminal along with said unneeded object” contradicts prior Claim 5 and the inventive concept. “Unneeded” objects would not be installed in the mobile terminal, but rather deleted as per Claim 5. Examiner assumes applicant meant to say “when the needed object has been installed,” or perhaps “when the selected object has been installed.” Appropriate corrections are required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 68-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claim 68 recites the limitation “the information processing *system*” in Claim 34. There is

Art Unit: 2152

insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claim 34 refers to an information processing *server*.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
  2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
  4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
7. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 3, 4, 46, 47, 49, 16, 17, 20, 21, 23, 18, 19, 57, 58, 60, 31, 32, 35, 36, 38, 33, 34, 68, 69 and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,332,025 B2 (Takahashi et al.), and further in view of US 6,928,458 B2 (Cedola et al.).

As to Claims 1, 3, 16, 18, 31 and 33, Takahashi et al. disclose an invention substantially as claimed, including an information processing system, mobile terminal and server, hereby referred to as “the system”, comprising:

an information processing server connected to a network and including a server storage device having a plurality of objects stored therein, each object having unique information and a URL (Uniform Resource Locator) for accessing to said information processing server for updating (Takahashi et al. – Column 5, lines 37-45 recite the client performing an install request from a server. Column 24, lines 1-2 recite the use of URL); and

at least one [sic] terminal being connected to said network for transmitting an install request including an install list including said unique information and the URL of an object among said plural objects that is necessary for installation (Takahashi et al. – Column 5, lines 37-45 recite the client performing an install request from a server. Column 18 lines 51-57 recite the client indicating the list of items for the server to send. Column 24, lines 1-2 recite the use of URL in installation);

said information processing server referring to said install list to select an object for transmission from said plural objects stored in said server storage device to transmit the selected object (Takahashi et al. –Column 24, lines 1-2 recite the use of URL referencing. Column 18, lines 56-57 recite the transmission to the client).

Takahashi does not explicitly disclose, but Cedola et al. disclose an invention substantially as claimed, including mobile terminal (Cedola et al. – Claim 11 recites the

first data store {server} connected to a second data store {mobile device} via a network for sync operations).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the use of mobile devices taught by Cedola et al., with terminal being connected to said network taught by Takahashi et al.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to expand the network connection to include wireless clients.

As to Claims 2, 4, 17, 19, 32 and 34, the combination of Takahashi et al. and Cedola et al. discloses an invention substantially as claimed, including the system according to claims 1, 3, 16, 18, 31 and 33 respectively, wherein

said mobile terminal includes a terminal storage device having stored therein a group of objects among said plural objects (Cedola et al – Claim 11 recites objects that exist on the second data store);

said install request further including an installed list including therein the unique information and the URL of said group of objects (Takahashi et al. – Column 23, lines 66-67 and Column 24, lines 1-3 recite the list pointing to URL); and

wherein said information processing server refers to said installed list to form a list of unneeded objects, among the objects of said group of objects, said unneeded object being an object which becomes unnecessary when said selected object has been installed on said terminal storage device, and sends said list of unneeded objects to said mobile terminal along with said selected object (Cedola et al. – Claim 11 recites the



determination of the list of objects that need to be changed or deleted on the second data store, and determines the actions of change or deletion to be performed by the second data store).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine wherein said information processing server refers to said installed list to form a list of unneeded objects, among the objects of said group of objects, said unneeded object being an object which becomes unnecessary when said selected object has been installed on said terminal storage device, and sends said list of unneeded objects to said mobile terminal along with said selected object taught by Cedola et al., with the list of items to be sent to the client taught by Takahashi et al.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to alert the client which objects the client can delete to make room for the new application (Cedola et al. - Claim 11).

As to Claims 5, 46, 57, 20, 35 and 68, the combination of Takahashi et al. and Cedola et al. discloses an invention substantially as claimed, including the system according to claims 2, 4, 19, 17, 32 and 34 respectively, wherein

said mobile terminal performs installs the selected object sent from said information processing server in said terminal storage device, said mobile terminal referring to the list of unneeded objects sent from said information processing server to delete said unneeded object from said group of objects (Cedola et al. – Claim 11 recites the determination of the list of objects that need to be changed or deleted on the second

data store, and determines the actions of change or deletion to be performed by the second data store); and

wherein said selected object and the deleted group of objects are stored in said terminal storage device as an updated group of objects by said mobile terminal (Cedola et al. – Claim 11 recites the update of the second data store's record of installed objects).

The motivation and obviousness arguments are the same as in Claim 2.

As to Claims 6, 47, 21, 58, 36 and 69, the combination of Takahashi et al. and Cedola et al. discloses an invention substantially as claimed, including the system according to claims 5, 46, 20, 57, 35 and 68 respectively, wherein

said install request further includes terminal identification information for discriminating said mobile terminal (Takahashi et al. – Column 26, lines 8-13 recite the use of the terminal's ID for discriminating purposes);

said information processing server forming a list of state of use of the objects, responsive to said install request, to store said list in said server storage device (Cedola et al. – Claim 11 recites the altered record after synchronization);

said list of state of use of the objects having therein said terminal identification information (Cedola et al. – Claim 11 recites the altered record after download), said unique information and the URL of the unneeded object (Takahashi et al. – Column 23, lines 66-67 and Column 24, lines 1-3 recite the list pointing to URL), presently deleted, said unique information and the URL of said group of objects having said unneeded

object deleted (Cedola et al. – Claim 11 recites the altered record after download), and said unique information and the URL of presently newly installed selected object (Takahashi et al. – Column 23, lines 66-67 and Column 24, lines 1-3 recite the list pointing to URL), stated by said information processing server (Cedola et al. – Claim 11 recites the altered record after download).

The motivation and obviousness arguments are the same as in Claim 2.

As to Claims 8, 49, 23, 60, 38 and 71, the combination of Takahashi et al. and Cedola et al. discloses an invention substantially as claimed, including the information processing system according to claims 5, 46, 20, 57, 35 and 68 respectively, wherein said information processing server refers to said install list to select said needed object from said plural objects stored in said server storage device (Cedola et al. – Claim 11 recites the determination of the list of objects that need to be added, changed or deleted on the second data store, and determines the actions of change or deletion to be performed by the second data store);

said information processing server referring to said installed list to select from said plural objects stored in said server storage device a link object including said unique information and the URL, said link object being linked to said needed object and not being stated in the installed list, said information processing server sending said needed object and said link object to said mobile terminal as said selected object (Cedola et al. – Claim 11 recites the determination of the list of objects that need to be added, changed or deleted on the second data store, and determines the actions of

change or deletion to be performed by the second data store. Takahashi et al. – Column 23, lines 66-67 and Column 24, lines 1-3 recite the list pointing to URL).

The motivation and obviousness arguments are the same as in Claim 2.

8. Claims 7, 48, 22, 59, 37 and 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Takahashi et al. and Cedola et al. as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of US 7,171,651 (Greenberg et al.).

As to Claims 7, 48, 22, 59, 37 and 70, the combination of Takahashi et al. and Cedola et al. discloses an invention substantially as claimed, including the information processing system according to claims 6, 47, 21, 58, 36 and 69 respectively, wherein

said mobile terminal sends to said information processing server a recovery request, as said install request, for restoring the updated group of objects, installed in said terminal storage device, to said group of objects (Takahashi et al. - Column 5, lines 37-43 recite the request for required software from the server), and

said recovery request including a recovery request list having stated therein by said mobile terminal said terminal identification information and said unique information as well as the URL of said updated group of objects installed in said terminal storage device (Takahashi et al. – Column 23, lines 66-67 and Column 24, lines 1-3 recite the list containing URL and address information); and

said information processing server referring to said recovery request list and the list of State of use of the objects stored in said server storage device to select from said

Art Unit: 2152

plural objects stored in said server storage device said unneeded object to be installed by said mobile terminal in said terminal storage device (Cedola et al. – Claim 11 recites the determination of the list of objects that need to be added, changed or deleted on the second data store, and determines the actions of change or deletion to be performed by the second data store); and

said information processing server forming a list of unneeded restoration objects, among the objects of said group of objects, having therein the unique information and the URL of the selected object which become unnecessary when the unneeded object has been installed in said terminal storage device, said information processing server transmitting the list of unneeded restoration objects to said mobile terminal along with said unneeded object (Cedola et al. – Claim 11 recites the determination of the list of objects that need to be added, changed or deleted on the second data store, and determines the actions of change or deletion to be performed by the second data store).

The combination of Takahashi et al. and Cedola et al. does not disclose, but Greenberg et al. disclose an invention substantially as claimed, including when a malfunction occurs in executing each object of the group of the updated objects installed in said terminal storage device (Greenberg et al., Col. 2, lines 9-29 recite the generation of the malfunction event report and sending it from the client to the server where it is stored).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine when a malfunction occurs in executing each object of the group of the updated objects installed in said terminal storage device taught by

Greenberg et al., with an information processing server connected to a network and including a server storage device having a plurality of objects stored therein and at least one mobile terminal being connected to said network for transmitting an install request and said information processing server referring to said install list to select an object for transmission from said plural objects stored in said server storage device to transmit the selected object taught by the combination of Takahashi et al. and Cedola et al.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to expand a client-server updating system to include an automatic error reporting and recovery system to focus errors reported and relieve the burden of checking on each report manually (Greenberg et al. – Columns 1 and 2, “Background of the Invention” section).

9. Claims 9, 50, 24, 61, 39 and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Takahashi et al. and Cedola et al. as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of US 2004/0002943 A1 (Merrill et al.).

As to Claims 9, 50, 24, 61, 39 and 72, the combination of Takahashi et al. and Cedola et al. discloses an invention substantially as claimed, including the information processing system according to claims 8, 49, 23, 60, 38 and 71 respectively.

The combination of Takahashi et al. and Cedola et al. does not disclose, but Merrill et al. disclose an invention substantially as claimed, including wherein said information processing server forms an install execute sequence for installing said

needed object and the link object in a preset sequence and sends said needed object and the link object in said install execute sequence to said mobile terminal (Merrill et al. – Page 2, paragraph 0033 recites the server communicating download instructions to mobile computing devices).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine wherein said information processing server forms an install execute sequence for installing said needed object and the link object in a preset sequence and sends said needed object and the link object in said install execute sequence to said mobile terminal taught by Merrill et al., with said information processing server sending said needed object and said link object to said mobile terminal as said selected object taught by the combination of Takahashi et al. and Cedola et al.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to simplify or eliminate user intervention in downloads (Merrill et al. – Column 2, paragraph 0028).

10. Claims 10, 51, 25, 62, 40 and 73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Takahashi et al., Cedola et al. and Merrill et al. as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of US 7,272,815 B1 (Eldridge et al.).

As to Claim 10, 51, 25, 62, 40 and 72, the combination of Takahashi et al., Cedola et al. and Merrill et al. discloses an invention substantially as claimed, including

the information processing system according to claims 9, 50, 24, 61, 39 and 72 respectively.

The combination of Takahashi et al., Cedola et al. and Merrill et al. does not disclose, but Eldridge et al. disclose an invention substantially as claimed, including wherein if the communication between said mobile terminal and the said information processing server is interrupted during the install processing as from transmission of said install request from said mobile terminal to said information processing server until the object from said information processing server is installed in said terminal storage device, said information processing server discontinues the install processing in accordance with said install execute sequence (Eldridge et al. – Column 121, lines 35-45 recite the discontinuation of installation upon a crash, which interrupts the communication, and the ability to restart the installation upon the user's command);

said mobile terminal sending an installation re-initiating request to said information processing server in case the communication between said mobile terminal and the said information processing server is possible (Eldridge et al. – Column 121, lines 35-45 recite the discontinuation of installation upon a crash, which interrupts the communication, and the ability to restart the installation upon the user's command. The mobile terminal would send the re-initializing request upon user's restart input);

said information processing server on receipt of said installation re-initiating request re-initiating the discontinued install processing in accordance with said install execute sequence (Eldridge et al. – Column 121, lines 35-45 recite the discontinuation of installation upon a crash, which interrupts the communication, and the ability to



Art Unit: 2152

restart the installation upon the user's command. Once said restart command is given, installation restarts with previously unsuccessful loads).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine wherein if the communication between said mobile terminal and the said information processing server is interrupted during the install processing as from transmission of said install request from said mobile terminal to said information processing server until the object from said information processing server is installed in said terminal storage device, said information processing server discontinues the install processing in accordance with said install execute sequence and said mobile terminal sending an installation re-initiating request to said information processing server in case the communication between said mobile terminal and the said information processing server is possible and said information processing server on receipt of said installation re-initiating request re-initiating the discontinued install processing in accordance with said install execute sequence taught by Eldridge et al., with the downloading of objects taught by the combination of Takahashi et al., Cedola et al. and Merrill et al.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to allow the flexibility to restart a download in the event of an unsuccessful attempt (Eldridge et al. – Col. 121, lines 35-46).

11. Claim 75 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Takahashi et al., Cedola et al. and Greenberg et al. as applied to claim 70 above, and further in view of US 4,437,156 (Christopher et al.).

As to Claim 75, the combination of Takahashi et al., Cedola et al. and Greenberg et al. discloses an invention substantially as claimed, including the information processing system according to claim 70, and

wherein when said set-up program code, stored in said server storage device, is updated to the latest set-up program codes, said information processing server refers to said list of state of use of the objects to transmit said latest set-up program code associated with each of the objects of the updated object group, among the plural objects stored in said server storage device, to said mobile terminal (Cedola et al. – Claim 11 recites the determination of the list of objects that need to be changed or deleted on the second data store, and determines the actions of change or deletion to be performed by the second data store);

said mobile terminal updating said set-up program code stored in said terminal storage device to said latest set-up program code (Greenberg et al., Col. 2, lines 9-29 recite the generation of the malfunction event report and sending it from the client to the server where it is stored).

The combination of Takahashi et al., Cedola et al. and Greenberg et al. does not disclose, but Greenberg et al. discloses an invention substantially as claimed, including wherein a plurality of said set-up program codes, associated with said plural objects

Art Unit: 2152

(Christopher et al. - Col. 118, lines 66-68 recites the capture of program location where error occurred), are stored in said server storage device (Greenberg et al., Col. 2, lines 9-29 recite the generation of the malfunction event report and sending it from the client to the server where it is stored).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine a set-up program code associated with each of the objects taught by Christopher et al., with the malfunction report taught by the combination of Takahashi et al., Cedola et al. and Greenberg et al.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to provide the user/system a pointer of where the program failed for troubleshooting and recovery purposes (Christopher et al. – Col. 118, lines 64-65).

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. These include:

- US 5,974,568 – Hierarchical Error Reporting System
- US 2002/0111973 A1 – Method of Controlling Web Browser Document Image Downloads and Displays
- US 6,381,709 B1 – Process and Apparatus for Downloading Data from a Server Computer to a Client Computer
- US 7,136,903 B1 – Internet-Based Shared file Service with Native PC Client Access and Semantics and Distributed Access Control

- US 6,438,594 B1 – Delivering Service to a Client Via a Locally Addressable Interface
- US 6,434,568 B1 – Information Services Patterns in a Netcentric Environment
- US 6,199,100 B1 – Interactive Computer Network and Method of Operation
- US 5,442,771 – Method for Storing Data in an Interactive Computer Network
- US 6,829,655 B1 – method and System for Server Synchronization with a Computing Device Via a Companion Device
- US 7,287,089 B1 – Electronic Commerce Infrastructure System
- US 6,996,633 B2 – System and Method for Synchronizing Objects Between Two Devices
- US 5,853,367 – Task-Interface and Communications System and Method for Ultrasound Imager Control
- US 7,158,971 B1 – Method for searching document objects on a network
- US 6,463,427 – Use of Object Signature Property as a Search Parameter During Synchronization of Objects on a Computer
- US 7,206,806 B2 – Method and system for remote utilizing a mobile device to share data objects
- US 6,757,706 B1 – Method and apparatus for providing responses for requests of off-line clients

- JP 58181393 A – Iwasaki et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard G. Keehn whose telephone number is 571-270-5007. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 8:30am - 7:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571-272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

RGK

/Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2152

